UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,221	09/18/2003	Bernhard Strzalkowski	WMP-IFT-928	8468

24131 7590 11/07/2006

LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP
P O BOX 2480
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER	
EJAZ, NAHEED	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2611	

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,221	STRZALKOWSKI, BERNHARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Naheed Ejaz	2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Abstract

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the following: delete "MPW/nt" (page # 22, line 11). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 2 & 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Refer to claim 2, it recites, 'the data signal time window to start after a nonzero time period after the announcement signal' (page # 19, lines 2-4). It is not clear when the data signal time window starts. Is it after nonzero time period? Or is it after the announcement signal? Clarification is required.

5. Regarding claim 6, it recites, 'parity check signal and/or a transfer stop signal' (page # 20, line 3) Is it parity check signal and a transfer stop signal? Or is it parity check signal or transfer stop signal? Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 2, 5 & 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komatsu et al. (2003/0189984) (hereinafter, Komatsu) in view of Sharp (3,763,472).

8. Regarding claim 1, Komatsu teaches, 'transferring an announcement signal including at least one pulse (Abstract, page # 7, col.2, lines 8-14, page # 8, col.1, lines 8-14) (it is noted in the mentioned paragraphs that Komatsu transmits the preamble "a dummy data" signal (claimed 'transferring an announcement signal including at least one pulse') onto a bus and then sequentially transmits the essential data (claimed 'transferring a data signal')). Furthermore, Komatsu transmits the dummy data with a predetermined level until predetermined length of time is passed and after that he transmits the data by switching to the data output state (page # 3, paragraph # 0054-0056, page # 7, col.2, lines 8-14) (claimed 'within a data signal time window lasting for a prescribed period after the announcement signal')

Komatsu does not teach transferring of first and second channel.

Sharp discloses two electrical leads to connect each of channels 1 through 16 to distributing and collecting array and these two leads of channels are designated as b5-1, b6-1 (claimed 'first transfer channel') & b5-2, b6-2 (claimed 'second transfer channel') (Abstract, figure 1, elements 'Bit serial channel 1' & 'Bit serial channel x', col.3, lines 24-39) & (col.1, lines 67, col.2, lines 1-64) (it should be noted that the distribution and collection array include registers and store and transfer all kinds of information such as address signals & information signals (col.3, lines 60-68, col.4, lines 1-2) therefore, the circuit of figure 1 would be able to have different types of signals transferring during the

process by using different transfer channels (claimed transferring of announcement and data signals)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to implement the teachings of Sharp into Komatsu in order to handle the individual transfer data rates of the devices (peripheral devices) to present and receive data in a form that is amenable to the processing units with respect to the total transfer data capacity of the processing units as taught by Sharp (col.1, lines 25-40) thus enhance system performance.

9. With respect to claim 2, in addition to aforementioned rejection of claim 1, Komatsu teaches, 'configuring the data signal time window to start after a nonzero time period after the announcement signal' (figure 5, paragraphs 0066, 0070 & 0074).

10. As per claim 5, in addition to aforementioned rejection of claim 1, Komatsu discloses, 'transferring control information' (figure 3, elements 1110, 1105 & 1106 & figure 14, paragraphs # 0049-0051).

11. Regarding claims 8 & 9, Komatsu is transferring data signal which contains signal level "L" with the associated period (page # 3, paragraph # 0054) (claimed 'first signal level or second signal level) and that level signal is added to the head of the data sequence and is called a preamble (dummy data) (claimed 'announcement signal') (Abstract) (page # 3, paragraph # 0054) (claimed 'transferring announcement signals at regular intervals of time and transferring respective pulse trains representing the first signal level or the second signal level during data signal time windows following the announcement signals). Furthermore, Komatsu also teaching that signals levels 'H' & 'L'

are being switched according to the data period (page # 4, paragraph # 0070) which reads on claim limitations of 'a first signal level or a second signal level by transferring announcement signals upon every level change in the input signal'.

12. Claim 10 is rejected under the same rationale as mentioned in the rejection of claims 8 & 9 above.

13. Claim 11 is rejected under the same rationale as mentioned in the rejection of claim 1 above.

14. Claims 3 & 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komatsu et al. (2003/0189984) in view of Sharp (3,763,472), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Van Lahr et al. (4,772,963) (hereinafter, Lahr).

15. Refer to claims 3 & 4, Komatsu and sharp teach all the limitations in the previous claims on which claims 3 & 4 depend but they fail to disclose first and second magnetic coupling elements.

Lahr discloses, 'providing the first transfer channel with a first magnetic coupling element' & 'second transfer channel with a second magnetic coupling element' (col.2, lines 36-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to implement the teachings of Lahr into Sharp & Komatsu in order to improve bit error rate performance in data without compromising the maximum rate at which digital data is transferred as taught by Lahr (col.2, lines 30-50) thus increase system performance.

16. Claims 6 & 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Komatsu et al. (2003/0189984) in view of Sharp (3,763,472), as applied to claims 1 & 5 above, and further in view of Berger et al. (3,573,740) (hereinafter, Berger).

17. Refer to claim 6, Komatsu and sharp teach all the limitations in the previous claims on which claim 6 depends but they fail to disclose control information with a parity check signal.

Berger teaches, 'the control information with a parity check signal and/or a transfer stop signal' (figure 2, elements 61, 70 & figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to implement the teachings of Berger into Sharp & Komatsu in order to provide a real time data processing by continuously monitoring and controlling the transfer of data as taught by Berger (col.1, lines 49-55) thus enhance system reliability.

18. Regarding claim 7, Komatsu and sharp teach all the limitations in the previous claim on which claim 7 depends but they fail to disclose data signal in coded form explicitly.

Berger discloses, 'data signal is transferred in coded form' (figures 4 & 5, col.2, lines 37-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to implement the teachings of Berger into Sharp & Komatsu in order to provide a real time data processing by continuously monitoring and controlling the transfer of data as taught by Berger (col.1, lines 49-55) thus enhance system reliability.

Contact Information

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naheed Ejaz whose telephone number is 571-272-5947. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh Fan can be reached on 571-272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system; call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Naheed Ejaz
Examiner
Art Unit 2611

N.E.
11/1/2006

PANKAJ KUMAR
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER